

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action of May 29, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-14 are requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-3 and 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Srinivasan (US 6,850,064) in view of Jones (US 5,666,055).

Claims 4 and 5 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

The Drawings

The applicants are submitting a replacement Figure 1, in which the boxes have been labeled. An indication of the acceptability of the replacement Figure is earnestly solicited.

**The Claims Distinguish Patentably
Over the References of Record**

Claim 1 calls an MR receiving circuit which is switched between two or more modes in response to receiving a radio frequency control signal. **Srinivasan**, as the Examiner notes, includes a receive coil which has three coil elements that can be combined in different ways. As the Examiner correctly notes, Srinivasan lacks a receiving device that receives wireless reception of a control signal. Indeed, as indicated at column 9, lines 6-25, the selection of modes appears to be made by whether a driving mechanism is applied against leads A or across leads B. Thus, FIGURES 13-15 of Srinivasan not only do not disclose a wirelessly controlled switching device, they similarly do not disclose a switching device.

Jones fails to cure the shortcomings of Srinivasan. Jones does not suggest using a radio frequency control signal. Rather, Jones suggests using an infrared (IR) beam. It is not surprising that Jones would avoid introducing radio frequency signals into a magnetic resonance environment because magnetic resonance imaging systems are very sensitive radio frequency machines.

Because neither Srinivasan nor Jones teach or fairly suggest that radio frequency control signals can be used in a magnetic resonance environment, it is submitted that **claim 1 and claims 2, 3, and 7-14 dependent therefrom** distinguish patentably and unobviously over the references of record.

Claim 4, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been placed in independent form. Accordingly, it is submitted that **claim 4 and claim 6 dependent therefrom** are now in condition for allowance.

Claim 5, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been placed in independent form. Accordingly, it is submitted that **claim 5** is now in condition for allowance.


CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 1-14 (all claims) distinguish patentably over the references of record and meet all statutory requirements. An early allowance of all claims is requested.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, she is requested to telephone Thomas E. Kocovsky, Jr. at (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

Fay Sharpe LLP


Thomas E. Kocovsky, Jr.
Reg. No. 28,383
1100 Superior Avenue
Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582